

**Application No.:** 10/582,919  
**Filing Date:** April 12, 2007

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The interview was conducted on December 7, 2010 and attended by Hao D. Mai, Rabinder Narula, and Johan Andren.

### Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claim 1

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 3,579,831 issued to Stevens (hereinafter “Stevens”) and U.S. 5,588,838 issued to Hansson et al. (hereinafter “Hansson”)

### Proposed Amendments

None

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

The combination of Stevens and Hansson is improper because the purpose of the groove in Stevens is to reduce stress, which is possible when the groove is of a considerable size as taught by Stevens. A person of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify the groove in Stevens to be a microscopic in light of the microscopic thread in Hansson because such a modification would undermine the intended function of the groove in Stevens.

### Results of Interview

No agreement was reached.